

DOI: 10.46340/eppd.2021.8.4.6

**Olena Vahina, PhD in History**

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6526-9559>

*Zaporizhzhia National University, Ukraine*

## **THE ROLE OF NATIONAL STYLE AS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN POLITICAL NEGOTIATIONS**

The article is devoted to the study of the role and significance of the national style in the process of conducting international negotiations. The most important tool for resolving contradictions and preventing possible conflict situations in the context of modern globalization processes is political communication. One of the factors in the success of political negotiations is taking into account socio-cultural differences between partners or opponents. In modern political science, there are different views on the role of national style in the negotiation process. All of them agree on the recognition of the existence of a national style in negotiations, but differently, assess the degree of its impact on the nature and results of the negotiation process. The national negotiating style is closely connected with the concept of “national character”, the formation of which is influenced by culture, religion, language, historical past, political realities, geographical and geopolitical factors, and so on. An important aspect of the study of the national style of negotiation is to determine the role of nonverbal communication, which is significantly impacted by socio-cultural factors. National negotiation styles are divided into different types depending on the essential characteristics: cultural and civilizational characteristics, relation to time and space, the specifics of non-verbal means of communication, and so on. Based on the specifics of non-verbal communication components, national styles with “low context” and “high context” are distinguished, based on the relation to time – monochronic and polychronic, based on the perception of space – formal and informal. National style is the most important factor in political negotiations, but its role in negotiations should not be considered absolute, since the behavior of negotiators is also influenced by professional ethics, corporate culture, personality traits, and more.

**Keywords:** globalization, cross-cultural barriers, mentality, international negotiations, national style, national character, non-verbal means of communication, political communication.

The postmodern era of the modern world rejected the ideas of ethnocentrism, the existence of dominant cultures and embraced the postulate of multiculturalism. The practice of political negotiations, including international ones, is becoming more and more intense. The model of modern political negotiations is currently undergoing a structural transformation: instead of dialogue, a multicultural polylogue is emerging. The expansion of world political discourse is accompanied by a clash of national cultures, which allows for various kinds of conflict situations. The most important tool for resolving contradictions and preventing possible conflicts today is effective and fast communication. The effectiveness of modern political communications largely depends on the ability to take into account the national characteristics, traditions and customs of the participants in political negotiations. Thus, the success of negotiations, in particular political ones, requires familiarizing oneself with the national negotiating style and taking into account its features at the preparation stage of the negotiations. Therefore, in the context of globalization of world political processes, the question of the ethnocultural differences impacting the nature and results of communication between state representatives belonging to different cultural regions is extremely relevant.

The aim of the article is to determine the role and significance of the national style as the most important factor in political negotiations in the context of modern globalization processes.

Many scientific works of both foreign and domestic researchers are devoted to the peculiarities of the organization and conduct of international political negotiations, which, among other things, cover the issues of national differences in negotiations. Given the purpose of the study, the works of Russian researcher

I. Vasilenko<sup>1</sup>, in which separate sections are devoted to the national styles of official business communication, have proven useful. S. Sheretov focuses on studying the functions and rules of international negotiations, emphasizing the significant impact of national characteristics of negotiations on their course, nature and results<sup>2</sup>. In her work, the American researcher C. Lee makes a point that in order to overcome cross-cultural barriers, it is necessary to analyze the peculiarities of the other party's culture in advance, while developing each step of international negotiations<sup>3</sup>.

Ukrainian experts (political scientists, lawyers, diplomats) in recent years have also contributed to the study of issues related to diplomatic protocol and etiquette: we should mention the works of H. Kalashnyk<sup>4</sup>, O. Sahaydak<sup>5</sup>, D. Tkach<sup>6</sup>, T. Shynkarenko<sup>7</sup> and others. In the context of the study on the role of negotiations in the settlement of political conflicts M. Dobrova analyzes the specifics of national negotiation styles<sup>8</sup>.

The study of national styles of formal business communication mostly took place in the context of the study of the negotiation process theory. In recent years, the situation has changed due to the intensification of international political negotiations, which involve the interaction between partners of different national cultural traditions. At the same time, the influence of national communication styles on the course and results of political negotiations has not yet been the subject of a special political science study and requires further research considering globalization and the Euro-Atlantic vector of Ukraine's integration. All of the above led to the choice of topic and determining the purpose of the study.

In modern political science, there are several points of view on the role of national style in the negotiation process. According to the first, the national and cultural characteristics of the participants reflect rather insignificant characteristics of the negotiation process, and therefore have little impact on it. This approach stems from the intensification of international negotiations, especially in recent decades, which leads to the "blurring" of national borders, the interpenetration of national styles, the formation of universal negotiation standards. Globalization and integration processes contribute to the formation of a unified negotiating culture with its own rules of conduct, language, symbols, etc. This universal culture of negotiation is recognized by all members of the world community, although it may differ significantly from established national norms and rules of conduct<sup>9</sup>.

According to the opposite point of view, national and cultural specifics are, if not decisive, then at least very important in the field of international negotiations. This position is based on the denial of the artificial universalization of communication styles and the impossibility of forming a unified negotiating culture due to the existence of too significant national differences that cause cultural barriers in negotiations between representatives of different ethnocultural traditions. In addition, a significant element of national specificity is brought into the negotiation process by representatives of business, public and religious organizations, who have much less experience in international communication than politicians, and therefore cannot get involved in establishing common parameters of negotiations<sup>10</sup>.

There is a third, relativistic point of view: in each case, the degree of significance of national characteristics may vary. In the conditions of cooperation, i.e. in the situation of significant coincidence in positions of the parties, national differences recede into the background, but in case of conflict of interests one should expect greater manifestation of ethnocultural peculiarities. In this regard, addressing the national style of negotiation in a conflict resolution situation is particularly important.

Thus, all the aforementioned points of view agree on recognizing the existence of a national style of negotiation, but differently assess the degree of its impact on the nature and results of the negotiation process.

<sup>1</sup> Василенко, И. А. (2008). *Искусство международных переговоров в бизнесе и политике*. Москва: Научная книга, 236; Василенко, И. А. (2010). *Политические переговоры*. Москва: ИНФРА-М, 396.

<sup>2</sup> Шеретов, С. Г. (2007). *Ведение международных переговоров*. Алматы: КОУ, 155.

<sup>3</sup> Lee, C. (2007). *The New Rules of International Negotiation: Building Relationships, Earning Trust, and Creating Influence Around the World*. Franklin Lakes: The Career Press, 272.

<sup>4</sup> Калашник, Г. М. (2007). *Вступ до дипломатичного протоколу та ділового етикету*. Київ: Знання, 143.

<sup>5</sup> Сагайдак, О. П. (2010). *Дипломатичний протокол та етикет*. Київ: Знання, 398.

<sup>6</sup> Ткач, Д. І. (2016). Дипломатичний протокол та етикет (із практичної роботи досвідченого дипломата). *Наукові праці МАУП*, 49, 51-55.

<sup>7</sup> Шинкаренко, Т. І. (2009). *Дипломатичний протокол та етикет*. Київ: ВПЦ Київський університет, 296.

<sup>8</sup> Доброва, М. П. (2011). Роль переговорного процесу у врегулюванні політичних конфліктів: *дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата політичних наук*. Одеса: Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет імені К. Д. Ушинського, 182.

<sup>9</sup> Лебедева, М.М. (2010). *Технология ведения переговоров*. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 139.

<sup>10</sup> Калашник, Г. М. (2007). *Вступ до дипломатичного протоколу та ділового етикету*. Київ: Знання, 89.

In our opinion, it is important to show respect for national traditions and understand their specifics not only in conflict situations, but also in the cases when parties' interests in negotiations coincide, as it will significantly contribute to long-term cooperation.

The national negotiation style is based on the national character. In political science, this term is understood to mean a historically formed set of stable psychological, mental and behavioral characteristics, features inherent in a particular ethno-national community<sup>1</sup>. Interestingly, philosophers have been thinking about the influence of ethnocultural features and mentality on the nature of communication since ancient times. In particular, the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus emphasized the importance of national traits for understanding the human being. Herodotus, Pliny, and in modern times J. Locke, Ch.-L. Montesquieu and others have tried to explain the differences in national character by the peculiarities of geographical location, climatic conditions and historical traditions. Later, with the development of ethnography, researchers began to actively use ethnographic sources to analyze the national character.

Modern scientists focus on a systematic approach to the study of this concept. For example, Ukrainian researcher T. Potapchuk understands the national character as a system of "stable and typical for a given community features and properties that form not just the sum or set of characteristics, but internally integrated unity, systemic integrity of characteristics that... systematically reflect the specifics of cultural and historical progress of a given people"<sup>2</sup> and give this community a qualitative distinctions that allows to differentiate the psychology of one nation from another. The formation of national character is influenced by various factors, most importantly culture, religion, language, historical past, peculiar political realities, the nature of the elites, geographical factors (climate, terrain, etc.), geopolitical influences and so on.

The national character is the basis for the formation of the national style of official business communication. However, in modern political science there is still no generally accepted scientific definition of national style, due to a certain methodological complexity of distinguishing between ethnocultural features of negotiators' behavior, personal traits, national style, political culture specifics of different state representatives etc.

The national style of business communication is a unique set of features of etiquette, behavior, ecultural values and traditions of each nation. The national style is determined by the mentality of the people, historical memory and features of the national character. Knowledge of those features is essential for both politicians and people of other professions who communicate with foreigners to avoid the conflict of national cultures and to eliminate the associated inconveniences.

In the context of this work consideration is deservedly given to the definition of S. Sheretov, who understands the national negotiating style as features of national character and culture, the most common distinct ways of thinking, perception and behavior that affect the process of preparation and conduct of negotiations<sup>3</sup>.

There are three groups of characteristics of the national style: values, ideological and religious attitudes; the nature of the formation of the delegation, the powers of the participants and the basic models of decision-making; features of behavior during negotiations (the most typical tactics, the specifics of nonverbal communication, reaction to other party's proposals etc.)<sup>4</sup>.

This allows us to categorize the concept of national style of official communication in terms of organizing and conducting negotiations. According to I. Vasilenko, the national style in negotiations is a synthetic concept, the components of which are the focus on specific decision-making mechanisms, commitment to national values, customs and traditions, as well as compliance with certain rules of conduct deeply rooted in national culture<sup>5</sup>.

Modern researchers and scholars are increasingly turning to cross-cultural barriers in the political negotiation process. It is cultural barriers that can create significant obstacles to achieving the desired goals, so the ability to overcome or avoid them is extremely important for politicians. In the era of globalization and intensive international contacts, extremely important qualities of a negotiator include attentive attitude to ethnocultural features and the ability to understand both verbal and nonverbal language.

---

<sup>1</sup> Національний характер. (2002). *Філософський енциклопедичний словник*. Київ: Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України: Абрис, 414.

<sup>2</sup> Потапчук, Т. В. (2013). Національний характер українців як складова національно-культурної ідентичності. *Науковий вісник Донбасу*, 4, 41. <<https://nvd.luguniv.edu.ua/archiv/NN24/13ptvsnl.pdf>> (2021, June, 28).

<sup>3</sup> Шеретов, С. Г. (2007) *Ведение международных переговоров*. Алматы: КОУ, 73.

<sup>4</sup> Лебедева, М.М. (1999). *Политическое урегулирование конфликтов*. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 233.

<sup>5</sup> Василенко, И. А. (2008). *Искусство международных переговоров в бизнесе и политике*. Москва: Научная книга, 171.

An important aspect in determining the national style of negotiation is the role of nonverbal communication. According to psychologists, more than 60% of information during a conversation is transmitted through non-verbal components of communication, which are significantly impacted by socio-cultural factors<sup>1</sup>. The distance maintained by the negotiating partners, their facial expressions and gestures, appearance, posture and manner of communication – all these are examples of non-verbal language in the structure of the national negotiating style. In addition, the manifestations of nonverbal communication include eye contact, voice volume, features of perception of space and time, tactile contacts and more. As I. Vasilenko rightly points out, close attention to non-verbal aspects of cross-cultural communications will help participants in international negotiations to avoid embarrassing situations and show their respect for foreign partners<sup>2</sup>.

In the context of international political communication, cultural differences are embodied on a non-verbal level during greeting rituals, the exchange of gifts, through mannerisms, the expression of emotions, punctuality, and so on. For example, if Americans openly, sometimes unequivocally, express their opinions, the Arabs or the Japanese will never allow themselves to make a person blush because of a categorical judgment<sup>3</sup>. While representatives from Europe and North America usually sit cross-legged during informal meetings, this is highly inappropriate for Arabs: they are deeply offended by the look of the sole of the interlocutor's shoes.

In modern political science there is a division of national negotiation styles into different types. This division is justified, because the criteria of typology determine the essential characteristics: cultural and civilizational features, attitudes to time and space, the specifics of non-verbal means of communication and so on.

In terms of the characteristics of non-verbal components of communication, national negotiation styles are divided into cultures with “low context” and “high context”. The first group includes the English-American, German and Scandinavian countries, where nonverbal communication plays a relatively minor role: it appreciates the ability to speak briefly, clearly and to the point, ambiguity and uncertainty are not appreciated. On the contrary, in Russian, French, and Japanese cultures, information is communicated mainly by nonverbal means. According to M. Lebedeva, communication in these cultures is more intense, and depending on the context, the meaning of what is said can change almost to the opposite<sup>4</sup>.

National negotiating styles can be classified in terms of time, in this aspect they are divided into monochronic and polychronic. In the monochronic English-American, German and Scandinavian countries, punctuality and adherence to the negotiation schedule is considered the basis of business communication. On the contrary, in the polychronic cultures of Latin America, East Asia, and India, people are much less concerned about time.

Based on the criterion of perception of space, national styles can be divided into formal and informal. In formal cultures (most Western countries), attempts by partners to approach them very closely cause discomfort. In Latin America, in Arab countries, on the contrary, it is customary to communicate at a closer distance. The distance at which the negotiating partners talk plays a very important role. Increasing the distance accepted in the culture of one of the interlocutors can be regarded by him as too formal a style of communication, unnecessary rigidity, coldness. Conversely, reducing the distance can be perceived as unjustified familiarity. It is a known fact that Americans have a slightly larger personal space limits than Europeans (about 120 cm and 45 cm, respectively), and the Chinese, Koreans, Japanese have an even narrower personal space – about 25 cm. So, in negotiations with Western counterparts the Japanese or Chinese may involuntarily take a step forward to reduce the space somewhat<sup>5</sup>. That is why the notion of Asian “familiarity” is quite common among Europeans and Americans.

It should be noted that distinguishing national negotiation styles is the result of generalization and stereotyping. But the negotiation characteristics are not always inherent in all members of the nation, it is rather the most likely course of action in the negotiation process<sup>6</sup>. That is why the role of national style in

<sup>1</sup> Пиз, А. (1995). *Язык телодвижений: как читать мысли других людей по их жестам*. Москва: Ай Кью, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Василенко, І. А. (2013). Міжнародні переговори в бізнесі та політиці. *Stud.com.ua*. <[https://stud.com.ua/5895/politologiya/mizhnarodni\\_peregovori\\_v\\_biznesi\\_ta\\_polititsi](https://stud.com.ua/5895/politologiya/mizhnarodni_peregovori_v_biznesi_ta_polititsi)> (2021, June, 28).

<sup>3</sup> Сайтарли, І. А. (2007). *Культура міжособистісних стосунків*. Київ: Академвидав, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Лебедева, М.М. (2010). *Технология ведения переговоров*. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 145.

<sup>5</sup> Пиз, А. (1995). *Язык телодвижений: как читать мысли других людей по их жестам*. Москва: Ай Кью, 43-44.

<sup>6</sup> Добрава, М. П. (2011). Роль переговорного процесу у врегулюванні політичних конфліктів: *дисертація*

negotiations should not be viewed as absolute, as the behavior of negotiators is also influenced by the norms of professional ethics, traditions of corporate culture, personal traits and so on. In addition, the study of the national peculiarities of negotiation should be based on a specific historical approach: national styles change over time, develop and enrich themselves, so they should not be perceived as permanent entities.

Therefore, the globalization of political processes, the expansion of the world political space and the emergence of new international organizations all raise the issue of studying national styles of negotiation. Intensification of interethnic communication requires modern professional politicians to be aware of ethnocultural differences between the participants in the negotiations and to take into account national and cultural peculiarities in order to achieve the desired political goals. In the event of a clash of national cultures, there is a risk of running into cross-cultural barriers, which can be a significant obstacle to successful agreements. All this confirms the thesis of the important role of participants' national style in the process of political negotiations.

The formation of the national negotiating style is influenced by a number of factors, including ethnocultural values and customs, mental characteristics, specifics of nonverbal components of communication, basic decision-making mechanisms, the most common tactics and behavior of negotiators.

Non-verbal means of communication (facial expressions, appearance, gestures, posture, peculiarities of perception of space and time, tactile contacts etc.) play a special role in the structure of the national style of negotiation. Based on the specifics of non-verbal communication, national styles with "low context" and "high context" are distinguished. Important criteria for the division of national styles are also the attitude to time (monochronic and polychronic) and the perception of space (formal and informal).

The obtained research results can be used by specialists in scientific, applied and pedagogical areas. Given the globalization and the Euro-Atlantic vector of Ukraine's integration, the issue needs further development in the direction of studying the Ukrainian national negotiating style, which is currently being formed.

## References:

1. Vasilenko, I. A. (2008). *Iskusstvo mezhdunarodnykh peregovorov v biznese i politike* [The art of international negotiations in business and politics]. Moscow: Nauchnaja kniga. [in Russian].
2. Vasilenko, I. A. (2010). *Politicheskie peregovory* [Political negotiations]. Moscow: INFRA-M. [in Russian].
3. Vasilenko, I. A. (2013). Mizhnarodni perehovory v biznesi ta politytsi [International negotiations in business and politics]. *Stud.com.ua*. <[https://stud.com.ua/5895/politologiya/mizhnarodni\\_peregovori\\_v\\_biznesi\\_ta\\_politytsi](https://stud.com.ua/5895/politologiya/mizhnarodni_peregovori_v_biznesi_ta_politytsi)> (2021, June, 28). [in Ukrainian].
4. Dobrova, M. P. (2011). Rol perehovornoho protsesu u vrehulyuvanni politychnykh konfliktiv [The role of the negotiation process in resolving political conflicts]: *dysertatsiya na здобуття наукового ступеня кандыдата politychnykh nauk* [a dissertation for the degree of candidate of political science]. Odesa: KD Ushinsky South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University. [in Ukrainian].
5. Kalashnyk, H. M. (2007). *Vstup do dyplomatychnoho protokolu ta dilovoho etyketu* [Introduction to diplomatic protocol and business etiquette]. Kyiv: Znannya. [in Ukrainian].
6. Lebedeva, M. M. (1999). *Politicheskoe uregulirovanie konfliktov* [Political settlement of conflicts]. Moscow: Aspekt Press. [in Russian].
7. Lebedeva, M. M. (2010). *Tehnologija vedenija peregovorov* [Negotiation technology]. Moscow: Aspekt Press. [in Russian].
8. Piz, A. (1995). *Jazyk telodvizhenij: kak chitat mysli drugih ljudej po ih zhestam* [Body language: how to read other people's thoughts from their gestures]. Moscow: IQ. [in Russian].
9. Potapchuk, T. V. (2013). Natsionalnyy kharakter ukrayintsiv yak skladova natsionalno-kulturnoyi identychnosti [The national character of Ukrainians as a component of national and cultural identity]. *Naukovyy visnyk Donbasu* [Scientific Bulletin of Donbas], 4, 41 <<https://nvd.luguniv.edu.ua/archiv/NN24/13ptvsn.pdf>> (2021, June, 28). [in Ukrainian].
10. Sahaydak, O. P. (2010). *Dyplomatychnyy protokol ta etyket* [Diplomatic protocol and etiquette]. Kyiv: Znannya. [in Ukrainian].
11. Saytarly, I. A. (2007). *Kultura mizhosobystisnykh stosunkiv* [Culture of interpersonal relations]. Kyiv: Akademydav. [in Ukrainian].
12. Tkach, D. I. (2016). Dyplomatychnyy protokol ta etyket (iz praktychnoyi roboty dosvidchenoho dyplomata). [Diplomatic protocol and etiquette (from the practical work of an experienced diplomat)]. *Naukovi pratsi MAUP* [Scientific works of IAPM], 49, 51-55. [in Ukrainian].

13. Sheretov, S. H. (2007). *Vedenye mezhdunarodnykh perehovorov* [Conducting international negotiations]. Almaty: KOU. [in Russian].
14. Shynkarenko, T. I. (2009). *Dyplomatychnyy protokol ta etyket* [Diplomatic protocol and etiquette]. Kyiv: VPTs Kyyivskyy universytet. [in Ukrainian].
15. Shynkaruk, V. I. (ed.) (2002). *Filosofskyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk* [Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary]. Kyiv: Instytut filosofiyi imeni Hryhoriya Skovorody NAN Ukrayiny; Abrys. [in Ukrainian].
16. Lee, C. (2007). *The New Rules of International Negotiation: Building Relationships, Earning Trust, and Creating Influence Around the World. Franklin Lakes: The Career Press.* [in English].